

(c) REMARKS

The claims are 1-14 and 17-20, with claims 1-4 being independent. Claims 1-4 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors and to better define the intended invention. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to specify that the aryl group of X<sub>2</sub> is unsubstituted. Claims 2 and 4 have been amended to specify that the aryl group of X<sub>5</sub> is unsubstituted. Claims 17-20 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Support for the claims is found on pages 23 (Compound [1]-158), 28 (Compound [2]-85), 62 (Compound [1]-43), 64 (Compound [1]-60) and 66 (Compound [2]-40), and Compounds [1]-47, [1]-49, [1]-66, [1]-80, [1]-91, [1]-92, [1]-95, [1]-99 in Tables 1 through 6, and [2]-17 in Table 10.

Claims 1-4 were objected to due to typographical errors. Since these errors have been corrected, the objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner alleges that the specification does not support pyrenyl groups as substituents on X<sub>1</sub>, X<sub>2</sub>, X<sub>3</sub>, X<sub>4</sub> and X<sub>5</sub>, and therefore the limitations are considered new matter. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Support for pyrenyl groups as substituents on X<sub>1</sub>, X<sub>2</sub>, X<sub>3</sub>, X<sub>4</sub> and X<sub>5</sub> may be found on page 13, line 17 through page 14, line 3 of the specification. Further, pursuant to MPEP § 2173.05(i), "Negative Limitations," if elements are positively recited in the specification, they may be specifically excluded in the claims. See *In re Johnson*, 194 USPQ 187 (CCPA 1977). Therefore, since pyrenyl groups are positively noted as substituents in the specification, they may be explicitly excluded in the claims without being considered new matter. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under Section 112.

Claims 1-4 were rejected as obvious over WO 00/39247 (Hosokawa). Claims 5-12 were rejected as obvious over Hosokawa in view of US 5,989,737 (Xie). Claims 13 and 14 were rejected as obvious over Hosokawa in view of Xie, and further in view of EP 1221434 (Ishida). Hosokawa is said to disclose the arylamine compounds of instant formulas 1 and 2, and that the compounds are contained in a light-emitting layer. The grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

The present claimed invention includes a monoamino fluorene compound of formula 1 or 2. This has been further clarified by the amendments to claims 1-4, specifying that the aryl group of  $X_2$  and  $X_5$  is unsubstituted. In contrast, Hosokawa discloses a diamino fluorene compound. Hosokawa fails to disclose a monoamino fluorene compound like that of the present claimed invention. Further, in Hosokawa compounds 10 and 114, the amino group is connected to the fluorene group via a phenylene group. In contrast, in the present claimed invention, the amino group is connected to the fluorene group, *inter alia*, by a fused aryl system, not by a simple phenylene ring.

Therefore, the present claimed invention is distinguished from the compounds of Hosokawa. Further, the defects of Hosokawa are not remedied by the identified secondary references, which fail to disclose or suggest the features missing in Hosokawa. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is patentable over Hosokawa, Xie, and Ishida, whether these documents are considered separately or in any combination.

Wherefore, the claims should be allowed and the case passed to issue.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jason M. Okun/  
Jason M. Okun  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 48,512

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200